

The objections to the claims are responded to as follows: Applicant hereby authorizes the Examiner to enter Examiner's amendments to amend and correct the portions of the claims which are objected to.

The rejections of the claims under 35 USC 112 are responded to as follows:

- 5 Applicant respectfully submits that there is support for the claims in paragraphs 19, 24 and 26, in each of which paragraphs it is taught that a sign according to the invention can be rolled up into the shape of a scroll.

The rejections to the claims under 35 USC 102 are responded to as follows:

- Applicant respectfully submits that one limitation of each of the independent claims,
10 namely, "a sheet of electroluminescent material; a laminate material, between layers of which the sheet is disposed[,]" is not present in the Neufeld reference. Instead, Neufeld teaches, "[t]he sheet 22 is as above indicated, also a plastic sheet and has impressed thereon, the graphic data 20 as indicated above." In other words, a limitation of Applicant's claims, that the sheet of electroluminescent be disposed between layers of
15 laminate material, is absent from Neufeld. Rather, in Neufeld, the following obtains:

- Referring to FIG. 2, there is shown a cross-sectional configuration of the back cover 13 of the booklet. A first sheet 21 may be fabricated from a clear or colored plastic such as polystyrene or mylar and serves as a protection for a second sheet 22. The sheet 22 is as above indicated, also a plastic sheet and has impressed
20 thereon, the graphic data 20 as indicated above. It is, of course, understood that the graphic data need not be applied by an electrostatic process, but may be printed directly thereon by suitable printing processes employing ink which will adhere to plastic. Such inks and dyes are well known in the art and many examples of plastic materials having various imprints on surfaces thereof are widely known.

- 25 Underlying layer 22 is an electroluminescent panel 23.

In other words, Neufeld teaches that graphic data is impressed on one sheet, which is protected by another sheet, and that the electroluminescent panel underlies the sheet on which the graphic data is impressed. A limitation in common to each of Applicant's independent claims is, by contrast, that the electroluminescent material be disposed
5 *between* layers of laminate material, a limitation not taught by Neufeld.

The rejections to the claims under 35 USC 103 are responded to as follows:

Applicant respectfully urges that the Examiner has not set forth a prima facie case of obviousness. With respect to patentability over Neufeld, or over Neufeld in view of Field, there is no reasonable expectation of success. That is, Neufeld teaches adjacent layers of
10 laminate, under which lies an electroluminescent panel, and on one of which layers is impressed graphical data. There is no reasonable expectation of success, nor any motivation to modify, on the basis of Neufeld. With respect to patentability over Field in view of Calamia, there has been provided no motivation to combine the references, nor does Calamia teach all the limitations of any of Applicant's claims.

15 Applicant respectfully traverses all outstanding rejections and requests reconsideration and urge allowance of all pending claims.